

Design and evaluation of a personal robot playing a self-management education game with children with diabetes type 1

Blanson Henkemans, Olivier A.; Bierman, Bert P.B.; Janssen, Joris; Looije, Rosemarijn; Neerincx, Mark A.; van Dooren, Marierose M.M.; de Vries, Jitske L.E.; van der Burg, Gert Jan; Huisman, Sasja D.

DOI

[10.1016/j.ijhcs.2017.06.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2017.06.001)

Publication date

2017

Document Version

Accepted author manuscript

Published in

International Journal of Human-Computer Studies

Citation (APA)

Blanson Henkemans, O. A., Bierman, B. P. B., Janssen, J., Looije, R., Neerincx, M. A., van Dooren, M. M. M., de Vries, J. L. E., van der Burg, G. J., & Huisman, S. D. (2017). Design and evaluation of a personal robot playing a self-management education game with children with diabetes type 1. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 106, 63-76. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2017.06.001>

Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).
Please check the document version above.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights.
We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

Design and evaluation of a personal robot playing a self-management education game with children with diabetes type 1

10
11
12
13
14 Olivier A. Blanson Henkemans, Bert P.B. Bierman, Joris Janssen, Rosemarijn Looije,

15
16 Mark A. Neerincx, TNO, Leiden, the Netherlands

17
18 Marierose M.M. van Dooren, TU Delft

19
20 Jitske L.E. de Vries, Rutgers

21
22 Gert Jan van der Burg, Ziekenhuis Gelderse Vallei

23
24 Sasja D. Huisman, LUMC

25
26
27
28
29
30
31 **Corresponding author**

32
33 Olivier A. Blanson Henkemans

34
35 TNO Lifestyle, Leiden, the Netherlands

36
37 Schipholweg 77-89 2316 ZL Leiden, the Netherlands, E:

38
39 Olivier.BlansonHenkemans@TNO.nl, T: +31(0)888 666 186, F: +31(0)71 51 81 918

40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Abstract

Objective

To assess the effects of a personal robot, providing diabetes self-management education in a clinical setting on the pleasure, engagement and motivation to play a diabetes quiz of children (7-12) with type 1 diabetes mellitus (T1DM), and on their acquisition of knowledge about their illness.

Methods

Children with T1DM (N=27) participated in a randomized controlled trial (RCT) in which they played a diabetes mellitus self-management education (DMSE) game, namely a diabetes quiz, with a personal or neutral robot on three occasions at the clinic, or were allocated to a control group (care as usual). Personalised robot behaviour was based on the self-determination theory (SDT), focusing on the children's needs for competence, relatedness and autonomy. The SDT determinants pleasure, motivation and diabetes knowledge were measured. Child-robot interaction was observed, including level of engagement.

Results

Results showed an increase in diabetes knowledge in children allocated to the robot groups and not in those allocated to the control group (P=.001). After three sessions, children working with the personal robot scored higher for determinants of SDT than children with the neutral robot (P=.02). They also found the robot to be more pleasurable (P=.04), they answered more quiz questions correctly (P=.02), and were more motivated to play a fourth time (P=.03). The analysis of audio/video recordings

1 showed that in regard to engagement, children with the personal robot were more
2 attentive to the robot, more social, and more positive ($P < .05$).
3
4
5

6 **Conclusion**

7
8
9 The study showed how a personal robot that plays DMSE games and applies STD
10 based strategies (i.e., provides constructive feedback, acknowledges feelings and
11 moods, encourages competition and builds a rapport) can help to improve health
12 literacy in children in an pleasurable, engaging and motivating way. Using a robot in
13 health care could contribute to self-management in children with a chronic disease
14 and help them to cope with their illness.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1. Introduction

1.1. Self-management in childhood type 1 diabetes mellitus

The growing burden of chronic illness has led to an increasing focus on self-management in health care. This also applies to the increasing number of children with a chronic illness (WHO, 2010). For example, the incidence of childhood type 1 diabetes mellitus (T1DM) is rising rapidly, with a doubling time of less than 20 years (Patterson et al., 2009). T1DM is associated with serious short and long term complications, such as hypoglycaemia, nerve damage and micro- and macrovascular damage. These complications cause high morbidity and mortality, affect quality of life, and push up health-care costs. Complications can be reduced with optimal self-management (American Diabetes Association, 2003).

Children aged 7-12 with T1DM are encouraged to get involved in their diabetes management in order to minimise the impact of their illness on their short- and long-term health (Dedding, 2009). Diabetes self-management is positively associated with metabolic control and health-related quality of life (Hood et al., 2009; Levine et al., 2001; Lynne et al., 2002; Hoey et al., 2001; Kalyva et al., 2011; Wagner et al., 2005). It consists of (1) monitoring carbohydrate intake, physical activity and blood glucose, (2) recognising and mitigating symptoms of hypo- and hyperglycaemia, and (3) administering insulin to regulate blood glucose levels accordingly. In pre-adolescent children, parents play a prominent role in diabetes self-management. As children move towards autonomy during puberty, it is important that they become more skilled at self-management at an early age, albeit in line with their emotional, cognitive and physical skills (Blanson Henkemans et al., 2012; Scott, 2013).

1.2. Games for diabetes self-management education

1 Knowledge plays an important role in children's diabetes self-management. Enhanced
2 knowledge can contribute to more effective management, better adherence, and
3 improved HbA1c (Couch et al., 2008; Roper et al., 2009). It is advised to provide self-
4 management education for the treatment and prevention of hypoglycaemia, acute
5 illnesses, and exercise-related blood glucose problems (American Diabetes Association,
6 2003; Qayyum et al., 2010).
7
8
9
10
11
12

13 Knowledge can be enhanced through Diabetes Self-Management Education (DSME)
14 covering topics, such as blood glucose monitoring, insulin replacement, diet, exercise,
15 and problem-solving strategies (Couch et al., 2008). Qayyum et al. (2010), for example,
16 evaluated the effect of DSME on glycaemic control (HbA1c) in children suffering from
17 T1DM. Those children were educated in two sessions, during which general information
18 was provided about the disease, basic insulin therapy, planning for hypo- and
19 hyperglycaemia, activity, travelling and basic nutritional management. A significant
20 improvement was found in glycaemic control (in other words, HbA1c levels were found
21 to be lower) in children who completed the DSME programme.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Various studies have shown the benefits of gaming for DSME. In their literature
35 review, DeShazo et al. (2010) identified research on diabetes education video games,
36 reviewed themes in diabetes video game design and evaluation, and evaluated their
37 potential role in diabetes self-management education. The authors found multiple video
38 game interventions for T1DM on different platforms (PCs, smart phones and consoles),
39 including quizzing, skill training and decision-making. Themes included self-monitoring,
40 blood glucose, diet and exercise, and medical adherence. Overall, these games had a
41 positive impact on knowledge and self-efficacy, disease management adherence and
42 glycaemic control (hyperglycaemia and HbA1c). Notably, the authors also established
43 that few of the reviewed video games were tailored to a diverse population with varied
44 educational backgrounds and goals. This represents a missed opportunity, since
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
personalisation, or “tailoring”, can considerably contribute to the motivation to continue playing games and therefore to improve playing skills and knowledge (for example, Baranowski et al., 2008).

1.3. Personalised and long-term child-robot interaction

The European 7th framework (FP7) project ALIZ-E has been looking at how personal robots can help children to cope with their chronic disease and to improve self-management through adaptive and long-term educational interaction (www.aliz-e.org).

The ALIZ-e project used the Nao, an autonomous, programmable humanoid robot from Aldebaran Robotics. Details on the interaction and activities between the child and Nao robot, the use of a “Wizard-of-Oz setup (i.e., the robot was partially operated by the experiment leader), system modules and architecture are further discussed in in Blanson Henkemans et al. (2013).

Multiple other studies explored the benefits of personal robots for educating children. They show that personalisation has additional benefits for Child-Robot Interaction (CRI), regarding engagement, pleasure, fulfilling social needs and motivation. Also, personalisation proved to enhance the effects of CRI on developing math skills and increasing health awareness (e.g., Janssen et al. 2011; Van Der Drift et al., 2014, Tielman et al., 2014). These studies also showed a number of needs for further research on benefits of personal robots for educating children. First, these studies did not look at the effect of a personal, motivating robot for the development of knowledge required for self-management, in a clinical setting. Second, these studies looked at CRI on one occasion or a maximum of three occasions over a period of three weeks. It is unclear how the interaction is evaluated over a longer period of time. Finally, they lack a strong theory-based underpinning, such as the use of self-determination theory, for the intervention by the personalised robot.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Other research looks at the use of robots for individuals with Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD). Illustratively, a literature review from Diehl et al (2012) looks at different categories of robot research in this population. These categories are amongst others the use of robots to elicit behaviours (for example, promote prosocial behaviour), the use of robots to teach and practice a skill (for example, initiating a conversation), and the use of robots to provide feedback on performance (for example, positive reinforcement when performing social behaviour). Their results showed notably that most studies are exploratory and have methodological limitations. Based on these studies, it is difficult to draw firm conclusions about the clinical utility of robots in children with ASD.

Considering the benefits of a personal motivating robot discussed in the literature and need for further research on the effect of personalisation in CRI in a clinical setting over a prolonged period, with a strong theoretical underpinning, on developing diabetes self-management knowledge, a pilot study was conducted. It tested a robot applying personalised behaviour, based on the self-determination theory, and playing a DSME quiz (Blanson Henkemans et al, 2013). Five children aged 8-12 participated in the study located at the Wilhelmina Children's Hospital (WKZ) in the Netherlands. The results of pre-post testing showed that diabetes knowledge was enhanced. In addition, the children said the robot and quiz were pleasurable, but this appreciation declined over time. The children looked more at the personal robot than the neutral robot and spoke to it more.

The outcomes of this pilot resulted in a study, described in the current paper. Children aged 7-14 with T1DM interacted with a personal or neutral robot at a diabetes clinic or were assigned to a control group (care as usual). As in the pilot, the aim was to establish an empirical basis for 1) a “learning by playing with a robot” approach over a prolonged period, and 2) the effects of personalisation on child-robot interaction in a

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
clinical setting. Results could provide a considerable step in the further development of social robots, as studied in the ALIZ-E project.

2. Design of personal robot playing a diabetes game

2.1. Quiz to learn about diabetes

In this study, the child and robot played a diabetes quiz. They took turns in asking multiple-choice questions about diabetes (for example, “What do you do for your diabetes before performing sports” and “How do you recognise a hyper?”) and topics of interests for children (such as “On what side of the road do they drive in Thailand?”).

The child and the robot played three quiz sessions , one every six weeks. One session counted multiple quiz rounds, to a maximum of six. During one round, the child and robot both asked and answered two questions, of which one was about diabetes. After rounds three, four, five and six, the robot asked the child whether he or she wanted to play another round or to end the game. Thus, during each session, it was possible for the child and the robot to answer a total of twelve questions each, of which six were about diabetes. Within both categories of quiz questions (general and diabetes), the questions were fully randomized, although a quiz question was only posed once per session. As such, each question could be posed by the natural robot, the personal robot or the child. With this approach, we aimed at minimizing the impact of possible variance in the difficulty level of the questions on the children motivation and knowledge level.

The child and the robot shared a monitor (tablet PC). It displayed the quiz question, multiple-choice answers and the scores of both the robot and the child. The monitor was placed on a seesaw-like device, allowing the monitor to be flipped after every turn (Figure 1). The robot was programmed to sometimes answer incorrectly or make a random guess. The robot could randomly answer the question right or wrong with overall a ratio 4 to 1. This ratio

1 is based on experiences from the pilot study, in which the children also answered the
2 questions correct and incorrect with an average ratio of 4 to 1 (Blanson Henkemans et al.,
3 2013). If either the child or robot answered a question correctly, they received a point. At the
4 end of a session, the one with the most points at the end won the game. This motivated
5 children to continue to play, e.g., if a child lost from the robot, he/she was motivated to win
6 next time.
7
8
9

10 The pilot study previously conducted provided a suggestion for improvement of the quiz
11 (Blanson Henkemans et al., 2013), which we addressed during preparations for the
12 current study. The children thought the robot and quiz were pleasurable and motivating,
13 but disliked the repetition in the quiz questions. To address this issue, we enlarged the
14 database of quiz questions by inviting 60 children aged 8-12 in a school environment to
15 think of quiz questions they liked. We also asked the diabetes nurses from the Gelderse
16 Vallei Hospital to develop additional questions on diabetes self-management. The result
17 was a total of 150 questions in the game, 32 of which were about diabetes.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 **2.2. Self-determination theory for personalised robot**

32 **behaviour**

33
34
35
36
37
38 Personalised robot behaviour was based on the Self-Determination Theory (SDT), which
39 arguments that: 1) intrinsic motivation is the core type of motivation in the context of
40 play; 2) *autonomy*, *competence* and *relatedness* are psychological needs, which relate
41 to intrinsic motivation, in this context (Ryan et al., 2006; Frederick et al., 1995; Pryzbylski
42 et al., 2010). Autonomy refers to ‘the sense of volition or willingness when doing a task’
43 (Deci et al., 2000). Competence refers to ‘the need for a challenge and the feeling of
44 effectance’ (Deci, 1975). Relatedness refers to ‘when a person feels connected with
45 others’ (Ryan & Deci, 2001).
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 Specific strategies can be applied to enhance each of these needs (Niemic & Ryan,
57 2009). Strategies for enhancing autonomy include providing choice and meaningful
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 rationales for learning activities, acknowledging children's' feelings about those topics,
2 and minimising pressure and control. These strategies were incorporated as follows. The
3 personal robot encouraged the children during the quiz, to think of activities for self-
4 managing their diabetes in personally relevant situations (for example: "You're playing
5 your favourite sport 'football' and need to urinate frequently. What should you do?").
6
7 Furthermore, the robot let the children choose whether to play another round, putting the
8 children in charge ("Do you want to play another round?"). In addition, the robot
9 acknowledged the child's mood (for example, excited, glad, bored, frustrated) and then
10 asked whether the child wanted to continue playing ("I see you are a bit bored. Do you
11 still want to play one more round?").
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 Strategies for enhancing competence include providing effectance-relevant, as
24 opposed to norm-based evaluative, feedback and optimally challenging tasks. To further
25 a sense of competence, the personal robot provided positive comments and
26 reinforcement. At the end of each quiz round, the robot asked the children their opinion
27 on the game (discussing topics such as pleasure level, level of difficulty, and
28 expectations about winning or losing). The personal robot provided feedback on the
29 child's performance and encouraged competition. For example, when the child was
30 ahead of the robot in points, it said: "You're winning, but I will do my best to catch up!"
31
32 When the child was behind it provided motivation by explaining that there was still a
33 chance to catch up if the child played well and the robot stated it was convinced the child
34 had it in him or her. The robot for example said: "You are behind in points. You are a
35 good player and I believe you can catch up." The robot provided comments on the
36 child's answer, taking into consideration the child answer to the question (right or wrong)
37 in the previous session. For example, if the child answered a question correctly in the
38 second session after getting it wrong in the first session, the robot responded to this by
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 saying things like “Last time you did not know the answer to this question, but now you
2 do. You really are getting better at this quiz!”.

3
4 Strategies for enhancing relatedness include conveying a personal, positive and
5 respectful approach and respect for the children. The expectation is that responding to
6 these needs will increase the motivation to play a game or at least maintain it at a high
7 level. The personal robot used the child’s name during the interaction, adjusted the
8 colour of its eyes to the child’s favourite colour. The children could also put personal
9 questions to the personal robot at all the sessions before the quiz started. For example,
10 the child could ask the robot about its age, background, and favourite sports. Since both
11 the robot and the child put questions to each other, they got to know more about each
12 other (See Table 1 for a case study of a child interacting with both robots).

23 **2.3. Research question**

24
25 The research question we wished to answer was: "How can a personal robot, which
26 applies strategies enhancing autonomy, competence and relatedness, contribute to
27 children’s perceived pleasure and engagement with, and motivation for, learning about
28 diabetes and to their knowledge of diabetes?"

39 **3. Evaluation**

40
41 For this study we designed a personal robot playing a DSME quiz. We hypothesised that
42 playing multiple DSME quizzes with a robot contributes to self-management knowledge
43 in children with T1DM. Also, we hypothesised that a robot applying strategies derived
44 from SDT contributes to ongoing pleasure and motivation to play a DSME quiz.

54 **3.1. Participants**

1 The participants were children (girls and boys) aged 7-14 with a diagnosis of T1DM
2 dating back at least six months. Participants were recruited through the paediatric
3 department of the Gelderse Vallei Hospital in Ede (Netherlands). The study protocol was
4 approved by the ethics committee of the Gelderse Vallei. Parents and children received
5 a letter with information about the study (goal, results, contribution to ALIZ-e project,
6 data processing and rights) and an invitation to participate in the study. Parents gave
7 written informed consent for participation of their children in the study and the children
8 provided verbal assent and an initialled consent form. A total of 45 children and their
9 parents were invited to participate in this study.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 **3.2. Study design**

24 A between-subject design was applied (Figure 2). Parents and children gave informed
25 consent and completed a questionnaire, relating to demographics and medical
26 background of the child. The children were allocated to the personal robot, neutral robot
27 or control group (care as usual). The study was conducted in three sessions at intervals
28 six weeks. The first and last session took place at the outpatient clinic as part of the
29 regular check-up, during which the child also met the diabetes paediatrician, nurse,
30 dietician and psychologist. The children made an extra visit to the hospital for the
31 second session. This session also took place at the outpatient clinic, but was not part of
32 the regular check-up.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 The children assigned to the personal or neutral robot groups played with the robot
47 at the clinic, in one of the regular consultation rooms. After the child entered the room,
48 the robot (either the neutral or personal one) introduced itself and asked for the child's
49 name, age, favourite colour and activity, and explained the quiz. They played the quiz
50 together, whereby, in both conditions children and robot were competing against each
51 other, by answering the most questions correctly. After playing the quiz, the child
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 completed a questionnaire. At the second and third sessions, the procedure for the child
2 was repeated. During the first session, parents also filled in a questionnaire. The
3
4 experiment was set up in one room at the outpatient clinic and the parents were invited
5
6 to stay in the room during the experiment. The first session took approximately 50
7
8 minutes, covering introduction (5 minutes), completing a pre-test (10 minutes), playing
9
10 with robot (25 minutes) and completing a post-test (10 minutes). The second and third
11
12 sessions approximately 40 minutes, covering completing a pre-test (5 minutes), playing
13
14 with robot (25 minutes) and completing a post-test (10 minutes).
15
16

17
18 The child-robot interaction was partly Wizard-of-Oz (WoOz). As described in the pilot
19
20 preceding the current study (Blanson Henkemans et al., 2013), the robot behaved
21
22 autonomously, but the experiment leader partly simulated the dialogue and the audio
23
24 sensors. The experiment leader instructed the robot system which phase of the
25
26 interaction to start (i.e., introduction, explanation of the quiz, quiz, and closing) and typed
27
28 what the child was saying to the robot (for example, the child's name and answers given
29
30 to the robot's question). To minimize potential influence of the experiment leader on the
31
32 child-robot interaction, the behaviour of the robot was fully scripted (i.e., followed a
33
34 prescribed routine). The personal robot had a number of additional behaviours in
35
36 comparison with the neutral robot, which were based on the SDT, as described in
37
38 section 2.2. Self-determination theory for personalised robot behaviour. Per condition,
39
40 the children had similar interaction and dialogue with the robot. Only the quiz questions
41
42 varied, which were randomly presented to the child and robot (see section 2.1. Quiz to
43
44 learn about diabetes for further details).
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 **3.3. Measures**

53
54 At the outset of the study, we asked the parents for their children's demographic details
55
56 and medical background. Collected HbA1c measures were standardized according the
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 IFCC reference system (Hoelzel et al., 2004). All children filled in a questionnaire about
2 their self-management behaviour using a Dutch translation of the Self-Care Inventory
3 (SCI). The SCI was developed by La Greca and includes 14 items (La Greca, 2004).
4
5 The questionnaire consists of four subscales: blood glucose management, insulin and
6
7 food regulation, exercise and emergency precautions. The answers can be filled in on a
8
9 five-point Likert scale: 1 (I never do this) to 5 (I always do this as recommended without
10
11 fail). When the SCI was used with children in the past, internal consistency was .77 or
12
13 higher (La Greca, 2004; Weinger et al., 2005).
14
15
16
17

18 To assess Health-Related Quality of Life (HRQoL), the Dutch version of the
19
20 “Questionnaire for Young people with diabetes” (DISABKIDS) was used. The
21
22 DISABKIDS group developed a European instrument that measures the Health-Related
23
24 Quality of Life in children and adolescents with a chronic medical condition and their
25
26 parents (Baars et al., 2005). The impact scale has a Cronbach’s alpha of .84. There are
27
28 12 questions about how a patient has felt in the last four weeks that require answers on
29
30 a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (Never) to 5 (Always). The time period covered by the
31
32 questionnaire was adapted to “last month” in the last three questions since originally
33
34 these refer to the burden of the diabetes in the last year, and the time between the
35
36 measurements was about one and a half months. This amendment was made in
37
38 consultation with a developer of the DISABKIDS.
39
40
41
42
43

44 To test the difference between the neutral and personal robot, the children in the
45
46 robot groups were questioned during the study about determinants of self-determination.
47
48 They were asked about the level of autonomy, competence and relatedness they
49
50 experienced while playing the quiz with the personal or neutral robot. This was done
51
52 using a translation of the Basic Need Satisfaction in Relationships Scale (La Guardia et
53
54 al., 2000), which was designed to address need satisfaction in particular relationships. In
55
56 this study, we used it to survey the child’s relationship with the robot. The instrument
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 consists of nine questions (for example, “When I am with the robot, I feel free to be who I
2 am”, “When I am with the robot, I feel like a competent person”, and “When I am with the
3 robot, I feel loved and cared about”). Each item was rated on a scale from 1 (not at all) to
4 7 (very much). This instrument has been used in the past to survey a range of sample
5 groups, including children (Milyavskaya et al., 2009).
6
7
8
9

10 The participants were also asked about the amount of pleasure they had with the
11 robot and the quiz, their motivation with respect to playing the quiz, and their diabetes
12 knowledge. Pleasure with the robot and the quiz was measured after each session on a
13 seven-point Likert scale using emoticons representing 1) Horrible; 2) Not pleasurable at
14 all; 2) Not so pleasurable; 3) Neutral; 5) Somewhat pleasurable; 6) Pleasurable; 7) Very
15 pleasurable. The children could also say in their own words what they liked and disliked
16 about playing the quiz with the robot. Motivation was measured through the number of
17 rounds the children decided to play and their desire to play the quiz in a fourth session
18 as a hypothetical option.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Diabetes knowledge was measured with a diabetes knowledge questionnaire,
33 covering 30 questions on diabetes and self-management. It was administered at the
34 beginning of the study as baseline and after each quiz session. The order of the
35 questions and the order of the answers per question were randomized. Also, we did not
36 provide feedback to the children on the questionnaire. This was to minimize a learning
37 effect from completing the questionnaire. The diabetes knowledge questionnaire was
38 based on the questionnaire developed for the pilot with the health-care professionals
39 from the WKZ and refined in collaboration with the professionals from the Gelderse
40 Vallei Hospital. The questionnaire and also the questions of the quiz played with the
41 robot stemmed from materials used at the hospital (in other words, folders, booklets and
42 websites) and were reviewed by the diabetes nurses from the different clinics. As a
43 result, consistency between the education provided during the study and during care as
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

usual was guaranteed. In each questionnaire, the questions and multiple-choice answers were randomised.

Finally, interaction between the child and the robot was captured on video and audio. The pilot study showed that there was a distinct difference in children's engagement in the interaction over time (Blanson Henkemans et al., 2013). To further explore these differences, we collected and analysed qualitative information (based on video observations) about the children's facial expressions, gaze, body posture and things they said to the robot over the course of the different sessions.

These recordings were then coded and analysed, with the focus being on facial expressions, gaze, body posture, and spontaneous verbal utterance (Table 4 lists the coding scheme). Coding items were derived from earlier exploratory observations conducted during the pilot study (Blanson Henkemans et al, 2013). The items observed during the pilot study were further refined with directions from the MUMIN annotation scheme, 'a general instrument for the study of gestures and facial displays in interpersonal communication, in particular the role played by multimodal expressions for feedback, turn management and sequencing' (Allwood et al., 2005). Also, we looked at the descriptions of emotions given by Du et al. (2014) for the items regarding facial expressions. Interaction was coded using Noldus Observer XT 11, which facilitates the coding of point events (such as laughing out loud) and states (such as leaning on the table).

The coding scheme was tested for inter-rater validity before coding all videos. We referred to Cohen's Kappa scale of agreement, which states that an agreement of 0.80 and above as substantial (Cohen, 1960). Two coders independently rated five videos. Their scores were compared for each video. For these five videos, there were 11 items that varied more than 0.10, ranging from 0.47 to 0.76. The coders looked at the videos together and discussed the moments where the coders disagreed on the scoring. The

1 moments were discussed until consensus was found, which ensured that the coding of
2 the remaining videos was reliable. If consensus could not be found, the description of
3 the item further elaborated. This was the case for item “Inquiring” and item “Leans
4 backwards”. In these cases, we gave more detail to the description, respectively, ‘The
5 child looks inquiring, that is to say the child observes an object, such as robot or tablet,
6 intensely’ and ‘Child leans backwards in chair, for example, reclines head on back of
7 chair, slouches in chair’.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 **3.4. Statistical analysis**

20 Data were checked for normal distribution using graphical summary of data, assessment
21 of skewness, descriptive statistics, and tests of normality. For initial between-group
22 comparisons of data, t-tests were carried out on the change in variables over time. We
23 also measured the interaction effect of the response variable group on participants’
24 perceived pleasure, motivation and knowledge. Finally, we compared level of
25 engagement through facial expressions, gaze, body posture and spontaneous verbal
26 utterances (frequencies and length) coded in the captured video and audio material of
27 the children playing with the personal and neutral robots.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **4. Results**

44 **4.1. Participants**

45 As shown in Table 2, 27 children (13 boys and 14 girls) participated in the study. One
46 child assigned to the neutral robot group dropped out before the final session and his
47 data was excluded from the analysis. The minimum age was 7 and the maximum age
48 was 14 (M= 11.04, SD=1.71). Children were attending primary (n=20) and secondary
49 (n=7) school. They had been diabetes patients for an average of 57 months (SD=27.67).
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 The minimum HbA1c was 51 mmol/mol (6.8%) and the maximum 91 mmol/mol (10,5%)
2 (M=67.91, SD=10.44). On a scale from 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest), their SCI score was an
3 average of 3.60 (SD=.52) and the HRQoL score was 3.44 (SD=.66) on average. The
4 children had a pump (n=20) or used an insulin pen (n=7) for their diabetes regulation.
5
6

7
8
9 Of these children, 16 children (seven boys and nine girls) were assigned to the robot
10 group (eight children to the personal robot and eight to the neutral one). The minimum
11 age was 7 and the maximum age was 12 years (M=9.94, SD=1.20). Children were
12 attending primary (n=15) and secondary (n=1) school. They had diabetes for an average
13 of 54 months (SD=27.19). The minimum HbA1c was 51 mmol/mol (6.8%) and the
14 maximum 82 mmol/mol (9.6%) (M=69.23, SD=9.92). On a scale from 1 (lowest) to 5
15 (highest), their SCI score was an average of 3.60 (SD=.54) and the HRQoL score was
16 3.26 (SD=.63) on average. The children had a pump (n=13) or used an insulin pen (n=3)
17 for their diabetes regulation.
18
19

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30 Eleven children (six boys and five girls) were assigned to the care as usual group.
31
32 The minimum age was 11 and the maximum age was 14 (M= 12.55, SD=1.04). Children
33 were attending primary (n=5) and secondary (n=6) school. They had been diabetes
34 patients for an average of 59 months (SD=28.86). The minimum HbA1c was 51
35 mmol/mol (6.8%) and the maximum was 96 mmol/mol (10.9%) (M=67.64, SD=11.81. On
36 a scale from 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest), their average SCI score was 3.59 (SD=.51) and
37 their average HRQoL score was 3.71 (SD=.64). The children had a pump (n=14) or used
38 an insulin pen (n=3) for their diabetes regulation.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48
49 Although the children in the control group were significantly older than the children in
50 the robot group ($F(25)=.024, P<.001$), both groups did not differ in baseline scores,
51 regarding diabetes knowledge, number of months with diabetes, HbA1c or SCI and
52 HRQoL scores.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

4.2. Autonomy, competence, and relatedness

As can be seen in Figure 3, the children were scored for the determinants of perceived self-determination - autonomy, competence, and relatedness - in their relationship with the robot over the course of the three sessions. We also calculated a total average score for all three determinants. On average, the children with the personal robot scored 5.94 (SD=.69), 5.50 (SD=1.01) and 5.51 (SD=.90) for total self-determination in the three sessions. The children with the neutral robot scored averages of 5.16 (SD=1.30), 4.91 (SD=.55) and 4.40 (SD=.50) for total self-determination in the three sessions. Children's ratings of autonomy, competence and relatedness were not normally distributed and we conducted a non-parametric test. When the two robot groups were compared, significant difference was found between the total SDT scores over time. However, the scores for the children who played with the neutral robot were significantly lower in the third session for perceived competence ($Z=2.69$, $P=.007$) and for total SDT ($Z=2.33$, $P=.02$).

4.3. Pleasure

As Figure 4 shows, the children rated the perceived pleasure with the personal and neutral robot for the three sessions on a scale of 1 (not at all) to 7 (a lot). Overall, the children gave the robot an average rating of 6.44 (SD=.96), 5.75 (SD=1.24), and 6.00 (SD=.97) ($t(15)=1.70$, $P=.11$) for the three sessions. The average pleasure ratings for the personal robot were 6.56 (SD=.73), 6.00 (SD=1.32) and 6.44 (SD=.73) for the three sessions. The average pleasure ratings for the neutral robot were 6.29 (SD=1.25), 5.43 (SD=1.13) and 5.43 (SD=.98). The children's ratings of pleasure with the robot and the quiz were not normally distributed and we conducted a non-parametric test. When the two robot groups were compared, it was found that the children who played with the neutral robot scored significantly lower in the third session for perceived pleasure with the robot ($Z=2.06$, $P=.04$).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

In addition, children rated the perceived pleasure with the quiz with the personal and neutral robot on a scale of 1 (none at all) to 7 (a lot). Overall, the children gave the robot average ratings of 5.81 (SD=1.11), 5.31 (SD=1.13), and 5.50 (SD=1.03) ($t(15)=1.05$, $P=.21$) for the three sessions. The average pleasure ratings for playing the quiz with the personal robot were 6.11 (SD=.93), 5.22 (SD=1.30) and 5.88 (SD=1.05). The average pleasure ratings for playing the quiz with the neutral robot were 5.43 (SD=1.27), 5.43 (SD=.98) and 5.00 (SD=.82). When the two robot groups were compared, no significant differences were found in perceived pleasure with the quiz ($Z=1.70$, $P=.09$).

4.4. Motivation to play quiz with robot

As Table 3 shows, children with the personal robot played 6.00 (SD=.00), 5.89 (SD=.33) and 5.89 (SD=.33) quiz rounds on average in the three sessions. Children with the neutral robot played 6.00 (SD=.00), 5.71 (SD=.76) and 5.29 (SD=.49) rounds. When comparing the two robot groups with a Chi-square test, it was found that the children who played with the neutral robot played significantly fewer rounds on average in the third session ($\chi^2(1)=6.11$, $P=.04$).

The children were also asked after session three whether they would have liked to play a fourth session, if possible. The children with the personal robot all answered in the affirmative. Four of the children with the neutral robot said they would have liked to play a fourth session. When comparing the two robot groups with a Chi-square test, it was found that significantly fewer children in the neutral robot group wanted to play a fourth time ($\chi^2(1)=4.75$, $P=.03$). Arguments for playing a fourth time included: "He is fun", "He is nice", "He is smart and I want to learn more" and "He is sweet and friendly". Arguments against playing a fourth time were, amongst others, "It takes time", "It is fun, but three times is enough", "After three times it becomes a bit boring", and "It is a bit one-sided". When we compared the personal and neutral robot, we found that the

1 majority of the children who interacted with the personal robot felt he was “friendly” or
2 “sweet” (n=5), whereas the majority of children who played with the neutral robot felt he
3 was “funny” (n=4).
4
5
6
7
8

9 **4.5. Knowledge**

10 Figure 5 shows that the number of diabetes questionnaire items answered correctly,
11 over the course of three sessions, by children assigned to the personal robot, the neutral
12 robot and the control group. The number of correctly answered questions at session one
13 was, respectively, 19.89 (SD=3.05), 21.00 (SD=3.06), and 21.36 (SD= 3.47). After
14 session three, they answered, respectively, 26.89 (SD=.1.54), 25.86 (SD=2.19), and
15 22.82 (SD=3.19) questions correctly. After session three, the children who played the
16 quiz with the neutral robot answered on average as many questions correctly as the
17 children who played with the personal robot (P=.23). When the robot groups were
18 compared with the control group after session three, it was found that the children who
19 played with the robot answered on average significantly more questions correctly than
20 the children who did not play the quiz with the robot (F(1,45)=7.27, P=.001).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **4.6. Children’s engagement with personal and neutral robot**

41 A total of 43 videos were coded and analysed (we failed to record seven interactions in
42 the first session) to measure the level of engagement during the child-robot interaction.
43 One video of an interaction in session 1 ended prematurely. In one interaction in session
44 2, the robot broke down for approximately 20 minutes. Data were adjusted to the actual
45 interaction time. The average interaction time with the personal robot was 1433 seconds
46 (SD=288.48), and the average interaction time with the neutral robot was 1273 seconds
47 (SD=299.45) (P=.14).
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 4 lists the average score of items per category and per session. The following items were significantly different for the children interacting with the personal or neutral robot. The children sat up straight more with the personal robot than with the neutral robot in sessions 1 and 3 ($F(7)=3.12, P=.01$; $F(14)=1.83, P=.01$). They smiled more often in the group with the personal robot during all three sessions ($F(7)=.05, P=.007$; $F(14)=7.85, P=.04$; $F(14)=1.95, P<.05$). They also looked more inquisitively at the personal robot in sessions 1 and 3 ($F(7)=.04, P=.01$; $F(14)=.38, P=.05$). They looked more at the personal robot than the neutral robot in session 1 and 3 ($F(7)=.04, P<.001$; $F(14)=.36, P=.05$). They made more short positive utterances when interacting with the personal robot in all three sessions ($F(7)=1.68, P=.001$; $F(14)=7.84, P=.02$; $F(14)=10.54, P<.001$). Finally, with the personal robot, the children used the robot's name (Charlie) more often than children with the neutral robot in sessions 2 and 3 ($F(14)=110.52, P=.04$; $F(14)=10.52, P<.05$).

A number of observations were made when coding the videos. Firstly, the children expressed annoyance (a total of 40 times) and boredom in a number of situations: when quiz questions were repeated, when the robot repeatedly asked the child if he or she wanted to continue or not, and when the utterances of the robot and child overlapped. Children expressed their boredom by sighing, rolling their eyes, yawning, leaning backwards in their chair, and drooping the corners of their mouths.

Secondly, we noticed two patterns in the children's behaviour. Children frequently looked up at the robot after finishing reading a quiz question to the robot. When the robot spoke a child's name, made a large gesture, or made a joke, the children paid more attention to the robot. After a personal question was put by the robot ("What is your favourite sport", for example), the children looked around to think about the answer.

Thirdly, we found that younger children were more involved in playing the quiz with the robot. We allocated the children to two age groups using median split. During the all

1 sessions, younger children spent more time leaning towards the robot (M=25.00,
2 SD=6.04; M=12.40, SD=7.38; M=10.60, SD=6.48) than older children (M=3.25,
3 SD=6.50; M=4.33, SD=4.08; M=3.83, SD=1.94), (F(7)=.04, P=.001; F(14)= 1.90, P=.03;
4 F(14)= 7.01, P=.03).

5. Discussion and Conclusions

10 Repeatedly playing a quiz at an outpatient clinic over a prolonged period of time (i.e., 6-7
11 weeks) with a social robot such as the Nao helped children with diabetes to learn more
12 about their illness and how to manage it. After three sessions, children thought they had
13 more pleasure with a personal robot, that is to say a robot that provides 1) flexibility in
14 the interaction, feedback and encouragement, 2) challenges the child, 3) elicits and
15 acknowledges emotions, and 4) refers to the child's interests during the interaction. A
16 personalised robot also fulfils more the children's needs for autonomy, competence and
17 relatedness while the quiz is being played. This enhances the children's motivation to
18 continue playing the quiz, which is reflected in the children's behaviour: children with the
19 personal robot paid more attention to the robot (in other words, they sat up straight
20 looking at the robot), they were more social (in other words, they used the robot's name)
21 and more expressive (they made more positive, negative and neutral utterances and
22 smiled and giggled more).

5.1. Ongoing play of self-management education games with a personal robot

23 To further design a personal robot that plays educative games over a longer period
24 of time and supports self-management, we made changes to the original quiz, the child-
25 robot interaction and the study design proposed in the pilot study (Blanson Henkemans
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 et al., 2013). To improve the quiz, we enlarged the questions database. The results
2 show that the children felt the quiz was as pleasurable at the end of the study, as at the
3 beginning. This is an improvement on the pilot study, in which the children clearly
4 expressed a dislike of the quiz over time, due to the repetition of the questions.
5
6 Nevertheless, children did respond with annoyance when questions were repeated. We
7
8 are therefore faced with a trade-off between repeating questions to help the child learn
9 about their illness and the chance of annoying them by questions they already know.
10
11 This underlines the importance of tailoring the questions to the knowledge level of the
12
13 child.
14
15

16
17
18
19
20
21 The current study showed that children felt that the personal robot was more
22 pleasurable than the neutral robot and they were more motivated to continue playing.
23
24 Still, they did not find playing the quiz with the personal robot more pleasurable. This
25 suggests that the personalization of the robot character affects how the children
26
27 experience the robot, but not necessarily the quiz. To make the quiz itself a more
28
29 pleasurable experience, in addition to tailoring the quiz, it is advised to add features.
30
31 Examples are offering variation in the type of questions (e.g., multiple choice and open
32
33 questions) and adding a video and pose questions about its content.
34
35
36
37
38

39
40 To fulfil the children's need for relatedness and encourage them to take the initiative
41 more during the interaction, the personal robot invited the child to ask personal
42
43 questions at the beginning of each session. We found no differences in relatedness
44
45 scores between the personal and neutral robots. In addition, the audio/video data
46
47 showed that few children were actually willing to ask the robot personal questions. We
48
49 may have to conclude that simply inviting the child to ask questions at the beginning of
50
51 the interaction is not a successful strategy in terms of fulfilling the children's need for
52
53 relatedness or encouraging them to show more initiative. Other strategies to encourage
54
55 the child to feel related and show initiative could be more successful. The audio/video
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 data also showed that interaction felt static (non-spontaneous) and formal (functional).
2 The child and robot sat opposite each other at the table, playing the quiz. A possible
3 strategy could involve an informal and dynamic set-up in which the child and robot can
4 move around the room more freely and physical contact is possible. Applying the
5 strategy of inviting the child to ask personal questions later on, when the child and robot
6 have had enough time to establish trust, may also be more beneficial.
7
8
9
10
11
12

13 Finally, we looked at changes in behaviours between the different sessions. On the
14 one hand, observations of the audio/video recordings confirmed our findings based on
15 the survey data. On the other hand, they also provided a number of new insights.
16 Certain robot behaviours triggered the attention of the children, such as saying the
17 child's name and making large gestures. Finally, we found that younger children became
18 more absorbed in playing the quiz with the robot (that is to say that they did lean more
19 towards the robot). Children also expressed negative emotions that were not explicitly
20 reflected in the survey data, which were overall very positive. The first was annoyance
21 and the second was an emotion outside the coding scheme, but which we interpreted as
22 boredom (children sigh, roll their eyes, yawn, lean backwards in their chair, and the
23 corners of their mouths droop). By watching the videos, we were able to identify
24 situations that triggered these negative emotions, and therefore devise guidance for
25 improvements in the further design of a personal robot for educative activities. Moreover,
26 we suggest adding boredom as a focus for analysis.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **5.2. Directions for the future of educational child robot** 52 **interaction**

53 Study results generated directions for future improvements (these directions will be
54 worked out in the PAL-project, www.pal4u.eu). Firstly, the robot timed its verbal
55 reactions badly on occasion. For example, it started to talk when the child was still
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 talking or there was a long pause before the robot finally answered a child's question.

2 Observations showed that a number of children were annoyed by the robot's bad timing
3 (although other children did not mind at all). This timing issue may be a feature in a
4 Wizard of Oz set-up, which was applied in this study. The use of conversational fillers -
5 expressions such as "Hmmm", "Umm" - and head scratching could resolve this issue by
6 signalling that additional information is on the way, keeping the speaking turn, and
7 acknowledging/back-channelling (Pfeifer & Bickmore, 2009).
8
9

10 Secondly, although the children had pleasure with and learned from the quiz,
11 children have their own favourite learning styles (Leite et al., 2010). Learning styles may
12 be visual, auditory, reading and writing, kinaesthetic and/or tactile. Offering the child a
13 choice between different types of activity that incorporate these learning styles would be
14 a further improvement in the personal robot playing different educational programmes
15 with children. Examples could include sorting games (visual and tactile), keeping a diary
16 (writing) and/or watching and discussing an educational video clip (visual, auditory).
17
18

19 Thirdly, although the interaction and quiz questions were tailored, the personal robot
20 did not take into account differences in the children's cognitive, emotional, physical and
21 social skill levels. Scott (2013) underlines the importance of understanding the current
22 skill level, as it affects how the child manages his or her illness. This can be seen, for
23 instance, in how children at the age of eight increase their muscle control, show more
24 complex emotions, start to express opinions and develop close friendships. Children at
25 the age of eleven may express puberty, become less egocentric, develop reasoning
26 skills, and show empathy towards others. As a result, children with different skill levels
27 approach their diabetes very differently. To be more successful in teaching the children
28 how to manage their diabetes, it is important to tailor the interaction and educational
29 activities (mostly type and content) to individual skill levels.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Finally, the child-robot interaction took place at the outpatient clinic. However, children apply self-management throughout the day at different locations (such as home and school), and in collaboration with others, including parents and peers. In the Netherlands, children visit the diabetes clinic four times a year only and it would be useful if children could continuously consult a personal computer assistant about the illness and how to manage it. We would therefore suggest combining a physical assistant (such as the Nao robot) with a virtual assistant on a mobile device such as a smartphone. The virtual assistant should have the same form, functions, and architecture. A major benefit would be that the virtual assistant, which also has a built-in location recogniser, can facilitate situated learning. That is to say, learning in the same context, such as the home, school and outside, where it is applied (Lave & Wenger, 1990). This approach has proven to be more effective in the acquisition of content and pedagogy than traditional learning styles (Meyers & Lester. 2013). Illustratively, Looije et al. (2012) compared a virtual agent on a screen with a physical robot on the aspects of performance (learning), attention and motivation. Children played a health quiz with both the robot and the virtual agent. Results showed that, although the children preferred the robot, lack of embodiment did not affect the children's' performance and motivation. Other studies found that virtual agents are anticipated as social actors in children. Through expressing emotion, they can further contribute to motivation and learning in children (Kopp et al., 2003; Kessens et al., 2009).

5.3. Limitations

Children played three sessions with the robot, which limits our knowledge on the ongoing effects of personalized robot behaviour on their pleasure and motivation. After three sessions, we found that motivation fell off slightly. However overall, the level of pleasure and motivation remained high. Also, a number of children working with the

1 neutral robot said they did not want to play a fourth time. Our data provide no clear
2 indication of the time span after which children's interest in the personal robot starts to
3 decline.
4
5

6
7 Related to previous limitation, the difficulty level of the quiz questions were not
8 established, in relation to the children's knowledge level, and thus we cannot state its
9 possible impact on the children's motivation. One can imagine that quiz questions that
10 are too easy or too hard to answer, may have a negative effect on the motivation of
11 children to play the quiz. We aimed at minimalizing this effect by randomizing the quiz
12 questions (both general and diabetes related questions). Still, for future application of
13 the quiz, we advise to determine and match the difficulty level of questions in relation to
14 the knowledge level of the child. For example, in accordance with the theory zone of
15 proximal development, "an area of learning that occurs when a person is assisted by a
16 teacher or peer with a skill set higher than that of the subject" (Copple & Bredekamp,
17 2009). Thus, it could be beneficial to match the topic difficulty level of the questions with
18 the knowledge of the child and have the robot, who's knowledge level is slightly higher,
19 offers assistance the child to further develop his or her knowledge. Thus, as the child
20 improves his or her knowledge, the subject will change (e.g., from counting carbs to
21 injecting insulin) and difficulty (e.g., make the question more complex).
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 A third limitation was the use of a newly developed, non-validated coding scheme.
43 The existing coding schemes focusing on child-robot interaction such as the one used
44 by Oh & Kim (2010) did not fully satisfy our requirements in regard to the level of detail
45 needed to test our hypothesis (that a personalised robot affects children's behaviour
46 when a quiz is being played). Nevertheless, our coding scheme was based as much as
47 possible on more generic, validated, coding schemes such as MUMIN (Attwood et al.,
48 2005) and the description of facial expressions by Du et al. (2104). Our study showed
49 that the coding scheme was useful, as we were interested in the combination of gaze,
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 body posture, verbal utterances and facial expressions. We will continue to apply the
2 coding scheme and we invite other researchers to do so and to share their lessons
3 learned, for example by defining other emotions such as boredom. This would help
4 greatly in improving the coding scheme for child-robot interaction research.
5
6
7
8
9

10 **5.4. Conclusions**

11 Playing an educative quiz with a social and personal robot over a prolonged period of
12 time can help children to learn more about their illness and how to self-manage it.
13

14 Moreover, a robot applying SDT based strategies, furthering the child's sense of
15 autonomy competence and relatedness, is pleasurable and motivating. These strategies
16 entail offering free choice and constructive feedback, acknowledging feelings and
17 moods, encouraging competition, and building a rapport. By contributing to their
18 knowledge about diabetes, it could help the children to improve their self-management
19 and prevent complications in later life.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 **Acknowledgements**

36 We would like to thank the Paediatrics Department of the Gelderse Vallei Hospital in Ede
37 for their collaboration. We also wish to acknowledge valuable input from the children and
38 their parents.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **Conflict of interest**

47 The authors report no conflict of interest in this work.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 **Role of funding source**

56 This research was partly funded by the FP7 program ALIZ-E.
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

References

Allwood, J., Cerrato, L., Jokinen, K., Navarretta, C., Paggio, P., 2007. The MUMIN coding scheme for the annotation of feedback, turn management and sequencing phenomena. *Lang. Resour. Eval.* 41, 3-4.

American Diabetes Association, 2003. Standards of Medical Care for Patients With Diabetes Mellitus. *Diabetes Care* 26, s33-s50

Baars, R.M., Atherton, C.I., Koopman, H.M., Bullinger, M., Power, M., the DISABKIDS group, 2005. The European DISABKIDS project: development of seven condition-specific modules to measure health related quality of life in children and adolescents. *Health Qual. Life. Out.* 3, 70. Retrieved from <http://www.hqlo.com/content/pdf/1477-7525-3-70.pdf>

Baranowski, T., Buday, R., Thompson, D.I., Baranowski, J. 2008. Playing for real: video games and stories for health-related behavior change. *Am. J. Prev. Med.* 34, 74-82.

Blanson Henkemans, O.A., Hoondert, V., Schrama-Groot, F., Looije, R., Alpay, L.L., Neerincx, M.A., 2012. "I just have diabetes": Children's need for diabetes self-management support and how a social robot can accommodate. *Patient Intelligence.* 4, 1-11.

Blanson Henkemans, O.A., Bierman, E.B.P., Janssen, J., Neerincx, M.A., Looije, R., Van der Bosch, H., Van der Giessen, J.A., 2013. "Using a robot to personalise health education for children with diabetes type 1: a pilot study". *Patient. Educ. Couns.* 92 (2): 174-181.

Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educ. Psychol. Meas.* 20, 37-46

1 Copple, C., Bredekamp, S. (2009). Developmentally appropriate practice in early
2 childhood programs. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young
3 Children.
4
5

6 Couch, R., Jetha, M., Dryden, D.M., Hooten, N., Liang, Y., Durec, T., Sumamo, E., et al.,
7 2008. Diabetes education for children with type 1 diabetes mellitus and their families.
8 Evid. Rep. Technol. Assess. 166,1-44.
9

10 Deci, E.L., Ryan, R.M., 2000. The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and
11 the self-determination of behavior. Psychoanal. Inq. 11, 227-268.
12

13 Deci, E.L., 1975. Intrinsic motivation, Plenum, New York.
14

15 Dedding, C., 2012. Delen in macht en onmacht: Kindparticipatie, in de (alledaagse)
16 diabeteszorg [Sharing power and powerlessness: Children participation in (daily)
17 diabetes care]. Harper & University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam. URL:
18 <http://dare.uva.nl/document/146511>, accessed December, 2014.
19

20 DeShazo, J., Harris, L., Pratt, W., 2010. Effective Intervention or Child's Play? A Review
21 of Video Games for Diabetes Education. Diabetes Technol. Ther.12, 815-822.
22

23 Diehl, J.J., Schmitt, L.M., Villano, M. Crowell, C.R., 2012. The clinical use of robots for
24 individuals with Autism Spectrum Disorders: A critical review. Res Autism Spect Dis. 6,
25 249–262
26

27 Du, S., Tao, Y., Martinez, A.M., 2014. Compound facial expressions of emotion. P. Natl.
28 Acad. Sci. USA. 111, 1454-1462.
29

30 La Greca, A.M., 2004. Manual for the Self Care Inventory: Description and Psychometric
31 Support. University of Miami, Miami. URL:
32 https://www.psy.miami.edu/faculty/alagreca/SCI_manual_2004.pdf, accessed
33 December, 2014.
34

35 Hoelzel W., Weykamp, C., Jeppsson, J.O., Miedema, K., Barr, J.R., Goodall, I., Hoshino,
36 T., et al., 2004. IFCC reference system for measurement of hemoglobin A1c in human
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 blood and the national standardization schemes in the United States, Japan, and
2 Sweden: a method-comparison study. Clin. Chem. 50, 166-174.

3
4 Hoey, H., Aanstoot, H.J., Chiarelli, F., Daneman, D., Danne, T., Dorchy, H., 2001. Good
5 metabolic control is associated with better quality of life in 2,101 adolescents with type 1
6 diabetes. Diabetes Care, 24,1923-1928.

7
8
9
10 Hood, K.K., Peterson, C.M., Rohand, J.M., Drotar, D., 2009. Association between
11 adherence and glycemic control in pediatric type I diabetes: A meta-analysis. J. Pediatr.
12 124, e1171-e1179.

13
14
15
16
17
18 Janssen, J.B., Wal, C.C. van der, Neerincx, M.A., Looije, R., 2011. Motivating children to
19 learn arithmetic with an adaptive robot game. Proceedings of the ICSR 2011 3rd
20 International Conference on Social Robotics. Elsevier B.V., Amsterdam, the
21 Netherlands.

22
23
24
25
26
27 Kalyva, E., Malakonaki, E., Eiser, C., Mamoulakis, D., 2011. Health-related quality of life
28 (HRQoL) of children with type 1 diabetes mellitus (T1DM): Self and parental perceptions.
29 Pediatr. Diabetes. 12, 34-40.

30
31
32
33
34
35 Kessens, J. M., Neerincx, M., Looije, R., Kroes, M., Bloothoof, G., 2009. Facial and
36 vocal emotion expression of a personal computer assistant to engage, educate and
37 motivate children. In Affective Computing and Intelligent Interaction and Workshops.
38 ACII, 1-7.

39
40
41
42
43 Kopp, S., Jung, B., Leßmann, N., Wachsmuth, I., 2003. Max - A Multimodal Assistant in
44 Virtual Reality Construction. KI, 17, 11.

45
46
47
48
49 La Guardia, J.G., Ryan, R.M., Couchman, C.E., Deci, E.L., 2000. Within-person variation
50 in security of attachment: a self-determination theory perspective on attachment, need
51 fulfillment, and well-being. J. Pers. Soc. Psychol. 79, 367-384.

52
53
54
55
56 Lave, J., Wenger, E., 1991. Situated learning: legitimate peripheral participation.
57 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Leite, W.L., Svinicki, M., Shi, Y., 2010. Attempted Validation of the Scores of the VARK: Learning Styles Inventory with Multitrait-Multimethod Confirmatory Factor Analysis Models. *Educ. Psychol. Meas.* 70, 323-339.

Levine, B.S., Anderson, B.J., Butler, D.A., Antisdell, J.F., Brackett, J., Laffel, L.M.B., 2001. Predictors of glycemic control and short-term adverse outcomes in youth with type 1 diabetes. *J. Pediatr.* 139, 197-203.

Lynne, S., Schilling, R.N., Grey, M., Knafl, K.A., 2002. The concept of self-management of type 1 children and adolescents: an evolutionary concept analysis. *J. Adv. Nurs.* 37, 87-99.

Looije, R., Neerincx, M.A., Cnossen, F. 2010. Persuasive robotic assistant for health self-management of older adults: Design and evaluation of social behaviors. *Int. J. Hum. Comput. Stud.* 68, 386-397.

Looije, R., Zalm, A.M. van der, Neerincx, M.A., Beun, R.J., 2012. Help, I need some body. The effect of embodiment on playful learning. In P Blazevic et al (Ed.), *Proceedings 21st IEEE International Symposium on Robot and Human Interactive Communication*. Piscataway, NJ: IEEE, 718-724.

Meyers, S., Lester, D., 2013. The Effects of Situated Learning Through a Community Partnership in a Teacher Preparation Program. *SAGE Open.* 3, 1-9.

Milyavskaya, M., Gingras, I., Mageau, G.A., Koestner, R., Gagnon, H., Fang, J. Boiché, J., 2009. Balance across contexts: importance of balanced need satisfaction across various life domains. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. B.* 35, 1031-1045.

Niemiec, C.P., Ryan, R.M., 2009. Autonomy, Competence, and Relatedness in the Classroom: Applying Self-Determination Theory to Educational Practice. *Theor. Res. Soc. Educ.* 7, 133-144.

Patterson, C.C., Dahlquist, G.G., Gyürüs, E., Green, A., Soltész, G., EURODIAB Study Group, 2009. Incidence trends for childhood type 1 diabetes in Europe during 1989-2003

and predicted new cases 2005-20: a multicentre prospective registration study. *Lancet*.

13, 2027-2033

Pfeifer, L.M., Bickmore, T., 2009. Should Agents Speak Like, um, Humans? The Use of Conversational Fillers by Virtual Agents. *Lect Notes Comput. Sc.* 5773, 460-466.

Przybylski, A.K., Rigby, C.S., Ryan, R.M., 2010. A Motivational Model of Video Game Engagement. *Rev. Gen. Psychol.* 14, 154-166.

Qayyum, A.A., Lone, S.W., Ibrahim, M.N., Atta, I., Raza, J., 2010. Effects of diabetes self-management education on glycaemic control in children with insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus. *JCPSP*. 20, 802-805.

Ryan, R.M., Deci, E.L., 2001. On happiness and human potentials: A Review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. In S Fiske (Ed.), *Ann. Rev. Psychol.* 52,141-166.

Ryan, R.M., Rigby, C.S., Przybylski, A.K., 2006. The Motivational Pull of Video Games: a Self-Determination Theory Approach. *Motiv. Emot.* 30, 344-360.

Roper, S.O., Call, A., Leishman, J., Cole, R.G., Mandleco, B.L., Dyches, T.T., Marshall, E.S., 2009. Type 1 Diabetes: Children and Adolescents' Knowledge and Questions. *J. Adv. Nurs.* 65, 1705-1714.

Scott, L.K., 2013. Developmental Mastery of Diabetes-Related Tasks in Children. *Nurs. Clin. N. Am.* 48, 329-342.

Tielman, M., Neerincx, M.A., Meyer, J.-J.C., Looije, R. 2014. Adaptive emotional expression in robot-child interaction. *HRI 2014: proceedings of the 2014 ACM/IEEE interaction conference on human-robot interaction, Bielefeld, Germany, 407-414.*

Van Der Drift, E.J.G., Beun, R.-J., Looije, R., Blanson Henkemans, O.A., Neerincx., M.A., 2014. A remote social robot to motivate and support diabetic children in keeping a diary. . *HRI 2014: proceedings of the 2014 ACM/IEEE interaction conference on human-robot interaction, Bielefeld, Germany, 463-470.*

1 Wagner, V.M., Muller-Godeffroy, E., Von Sengbusch, S., Hager, S., Thyen, U., 2005.
2 Age, metabolic control and type of insulin regime influences health-related quality of life
3 in children and adolescents with type 1 diabetes mellitus. Eur. J. Pediatr. 64, 491-496.
4
5 Weinger, K., Butler, H.A., Welch, G.W., La Greca, A.M., 2005. Measuring Diabetes self-
6 care; a psychometric analysis of the Self-Care Inventory-revised with adults. Diabetes
7 Care. 28, 1346–1352.
8
9 WHO, 2010. Tackling chronic disease in Europe strategies, interventions and
10 challenges. Copenhagen: World Health Organization on behalf of the European
11 Observatory on Health Systems and Policies. URL:
12 <http://public.eblib.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=557614>, accessed December,
13 2014.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 Legends

29 Table 1: A case study of a child interacting with the personal vs. neutral robot.
30

31 Table 2: Baseline characteristics of study participants, total and by group (N=28)
32

33 Table 3: Average number of quiz rounds played per session with the personal or neutral
34 robot (N=17)
35
36
37

38 Table 4: Coding scheme for child-robot interaction and data from audio/video recordings
39 (N=17)
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Figure 1: Child playing quiz with robot on see-saw monitor
47

48 Figure 2: Flow diagram for the RCT
49

50 Figure 3: Average score for self-determination in total and by determinant with the
51 personal or neutral robot for each session (N=17)
52
53
54

55 Figure 4: Children's perceived pleasure with the personal and neutral robot and with the
56 quiz over three sessions (N=17)
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Figure 5: Children's diabetes knowledge with personal and neutral robot and care as usual, at baseline and over three sessions (N=28)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 1: A case study of a child interacting with the personal vs. neutral robot.

Non-personalized Charlie	Personalized Charlie
<p><i>Kim enters the study room and sees Charlie sitting on a table. The eyes of Charlie have a standard white colour. Kim and Charlie start with the quiz. During the quiz, Kim and Charlie answer questions about diabetes and other non-diabetes related questions (e.g., “you are about to do some sports or other activity (like playing outside). Do you have to inject insulin or take a dextrose?”). After one round, Charlie and Kim are done with the quiz.</i></p>	<p><i>Kim enters the study room and sees Charlie sitting on a table. Charlie's eye colour is the favourite colour of Kim. Before starting the quiz, Kim can ask some personal questions to Charlie (e.g., “Where do you come from?”). During the quiz, Kim and Charlie answer questions about diabetes and other non-diabetes related questions. Charlie addresses Kim by mentioning her name and gives feedback on a question by also mentioning how Kim answered the question in a previous session. The quiz questions are also adapted to the sport Kim plays (e.g., “you are about to play a hockey game or do some other activity (like playing outside). Do you have to inject insulin or take a dextrose?”). Charlie also asks Kim what she thinks about the game and if she wants to continue playing or not.</i></p>

Table 2

	Robot (N=16)					Control group (N=11)					Total (N=27)				
	7 boys; 9 girls					6 boy; 5 girl					13 boy; 14 girl				
Gender	Min	Max	Mean	SD		Min	Max	Mean	SD		Min	Max	Mean	SD	
Age	7	12	10.00	1.10		11	14	00	1.04		7	14	11.04	1.70	
Diabetes since (months)	13	96	55.13	27.67		12	96	58.82	28.86		12	96	56.93	27.67	
HbA1c	51	82	68.17	9.55		51	91	67.64	11.81		51	91	67.91	10.44	
SCI (scale 1-5)	2.38	4.62	3.61	.55		2.46	4.23	3.59	.51		2.38	4.62	3.60	.52	
HRQoL (scale 1-5)	2.15	4.23	3.26	.65		2.77	4.77	3.71	.64		2.15	4.77	3.44	.67	

Table 3

	Session 1		Session 2		Session 3	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Number of rounds played	6.00	.00	5.89	.33	5.89	.33
Personal robot	6.00	.00	5.71	.76	5.29	.49

Table 4

Item***	Description	Session 1				Session 2				Session 3			
		Personal (N=5)		Neutral (N=4)		Personal (N=9)		Neutral (N=7)		Personal (N=9)		Neutral (N=7)	
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
<i>Body posture</i>													
Sits down (initial state)	Child sits in chair	487.92	275.34	354.00	397,16	489.41	213.14	569,91	220,95	596.33	274.63	755.87	283.23
Sits up straight (event)	Child sits up	10.40*	4.22	2.00	2,45	6.44	6.58	2,86	2,27	9.67*	5.00	3.00	4.12
Leans backwards (state)	Child leans backwards in chair (for example, reclines head on back of chair, slouches in chair)	31.24	34.73	0.00	0.00	8.52	12.81	5,03	12,22	4.85	6.66	0.00	0.00
Leans forwards (state)	Child sits in chair, but leans forward	558.60*	157.67	65.28	130,56	156.29	164.54	158,25	118,35	124.78	118.22	68.09	62.18
Leans on table (state)	Child sits in chair, leans forward and leans on table (for example with elbows or forearms)	78.26	150.34	33.96	54,57	151.78	205.61	1,73	3,43	25.16	45.75	32.33	71.46
Stands up (state)	Child stands (in front of table and tablet, for example)	124.22	201.78	0.00	0.00	0.14	0.41	16,53	35,73	25.16	45.75	32.33	71.46
Bounces on/spins on/rolls with chair (state)	Child bounces on chair, spins round on chair, or rolls around on chair	103.60	148.42	227.87	353,35	395.61	291.77	271,27	207,88	423.19	217.93	267.17	216.83

Child turns tablet (event)	Child turns the tablet towards robot when it is its turn to do so.	12.40	7.23	6.25	7.23	16.11	6.45	15.43	4.24	13.33	1.73	14.71	3.50
Robot turns tablet (event)	The robot turns the tablet towards the child when it is its turn to do so.	8.60	3.13	4.50	5.20	6.78	3.70	8.57	3.10	10.00	0.71	9.43	2.23
Child helps robot to turn tablet (event)	Child turns the tablet towards him/herself when it is actually the robot's turn to do so but is unsuccessful	2.20	2.39	1.00	1.41	1.67	1.66	1.71	2.87	1.11	1.27	1.43	1.51
Cheers (event)	Child cheers by lifting hands or verbal cheer such as saying "hurray!" or "yay!"	0.80	0.84	0.25	0.50	0.22	0.67	0.14	0.38	0.44	0.73	0.00	0.00
Shakes/nods head (event)	Child moves head in a shaking or nodding fashion	7.40	3.05	5.25	8.54	3.11	4.20	1.57	2.07	5.56	7.04	3.00	4.93
Lifts shoulders (event)	Child shrugs shoulders	2.20*	1.64	0.00	0.00	2.78	5.02	0.71	1.50	1.00	1.32	1.71	1.11
Fiddles with hands (state)	Child fiddles with hands: for example, fiddles with fingers, hair, tablet, chair and/or wristband	16.60	8.29	4.00	5.66	17.22	10.78	12.75	8.91	16.22	6.85	17.57	13.64
Facial expression													
Neutral (initial state)	The child has a neutral facial expression	1239.07	221.98	545.46	672.29	1486.77	373.50	1353.24	426.93	1189.70	159.86	1132.55	133.57
Smile (event)	The child smiles, that is to say the child lifts the corners of the mouth and shows teeth	60.80*	19.64	15.40	20.68	49.22*	31.69	21.14	10.98	45.33*	24.70	25.14	10.87
Frown (event)	The child frowns, i.e., lowers eye brows and has wrinkles on the forehead	5.80	4.27	1.25	1.50	3.78	3.63	5.14	5.96	5.56	4.75	5.86	6.20

Surprised (event)	The child looks surprised, that is to say the child opens the eyes wide open, lifts eyebrows, opens mouth, smiles	5.80	4.27	1.54	1.50	3.78	3.63	4.00	3.81	5.56	4.75	5.86	6.20
Shocked (event)	The child looks shocked, that is to say the child opens eyes wide open, opens mouth	1.60	1.14	0.25	0.50	1.22	1.30	0.29	0.76	3.00	2.45	3.14	2.67
Disgusted (event)	The child looks disgusted, that is to say the child frowns, curls upper lip	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.50	1.22	1.30	1.25	0.50	0.78	1.09	0.29	0.49
Inquiring (event)	The child looks inquiring, that is to say the child observes an object, such as robot or tablet, intently	16.20*	4.55	5.50	5.26	8.78	4.52	8.43	3.55	7.33**	2.40	4.86	2.04
Pensive (event)	The child looks pensive, that is to say the child looks neutrally at nowhere in particular, but is still engaged in activity/interaction with robot and/or tablet	0.20*	0.45	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.11*	0.33	0.00	0.00
Annoyed (state)	The child looks annoyed, that is to say the child sighs, rolls his/her eyes, pouts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.56	6.97	9.75	5.34	11.22	2.64	10.71	4.19

Gaze													
At screen (initial state)	Child looks at the screen of tablet PC containing quiz question, or the backside in anticipation for it to turn in the direction of the child	677.37	233.73	643.56	155.45	700.37	238.73	667.90	104.73	644.47	139.42	687.57	155.46
At robot (state)	Child looks at the robot	561.01*	101.88	81.15	116.45	317.76	129.85	317.76	129.85	237.74*	75.63	170.24	64.67
At parent (state)	Child looks at the parent in the room	47.44*	30.15	37.11	69.69	27.00	23.20	14.35	15.87	18.78	35.66	14.34	15.87

At experiment leader (state)	Child looks at the experiment leader in the room	27.91	12.31	30.26	62.15	28.71	29.81	33.87	24.69	14.86	9.48	12.42	10.74
Elsewhere (state)	Child looks elsewhere, such outside, under the table, to the ceiling, the wall next to the robot, and own hands	186.10	133.52	123.22	124.76	284.88	110.11	373.75	356.88	278.40	68.78	263.29	92.23
Verbal utterances child													
Short utterance pos (1-5w) (event)	Response of child to personal question with a positive connotation of between 1 and 5 words ("Yes, I like playing")	16.80**	2.59	5.25	4.11	13.44*	6.37	7.14	1.07	13.22**	3.38	6.43	0.98
Short utterance neg (1-5w) (event)	Response of child to personal question with a negative connotation of between 1 and 5 words ("No, I did not", for example)	1.00	1.22	0.55	0.50	1.56*	1.01	0.43	0.53	0.67*	0.87	0.14	0.38
Short utterance neutr (1-5w) (event)	Response of child to personal question with a neutral connotation of between 1 and 5 words ("My favorite colour is blue", for example)	8.80*	5.54	0.00	0.00	3.33*	3.24	0.43	0.79	2.78**	1.64	0.14	0.38
Medium utterance pos (6-10w) (event)	Response of child to personal question with a positive connotation of between 6 and 10 words ("I think playing the quiz is a lot of fun", for example)	0.80	0.84	0.00	0.00	0.67	1.32	0.00	0.00	0.11	0.33	0.14	0.38
Medium utterance neg (6-10w) (event)	Response of child to personal question with a negative connotation of between 6 and 10 words ("No, I didn't think the quiz was challenging", for example)	0.22	0.67	0.13	0.35	0.11	0.33	0.00	0.00	2.80	2.28	0.40	0.55
Medium utterance neutr (6-10w) (event)	Response of child to personal question with a neutral connotation of between 6 and 10 words ("Ok, I will see you next time", for example)	2.80	2.28	0.50	0.58	0.89	1.36	0.57	0.53	0.44	0.73	0.43	0.53

Long utterances pos (11+) (event)	Response of child to personal question with a positive connotation of 11 words or more ("I really enjoyed playing the quiz with you Charlie. See you soon.", for example)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.11	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Long utterances neg (11+) (event)	Response of child to personal question with a negative connotation of 11 words or more ("You already asked me that question. You still don't know the answer?", for example)	0.00	0.00	0.20	0.45	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Long utterances neutr (11+) (event)	Response of child to personal question with a neutral connotation of 11 words or more ("I don't know if you can catch up with my score. We will see.", for example)	0.20	0.45	0.00	0.00	0.22	0.44	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.11	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Laughs out loud (event)	Child laughs out loud	1.20	1.64	0.00	0.00	0.67	1.41	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.22	0.44	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Giggles (event)	Child giggles	5.00*	6.20	0.60	1.34	3.33	2.55	1.00	1.53	1.00	1.53	3.67	4.56	1.25	1.58	1.25	1.58
Robot and child utterances overlap (event)	The robot and child talk at the same time. For example, child starts to give answer to quiz question and robot invites the child to give an answer	4.40*	1.34	1.25	2.50	5.33	5.59	5.86	4.14	5.86	4.14	5.56	3.61	4.43	3.46	4.43	3.46
Child says 'Charlie' (event)	The child uses Charlie's name during the interaction	0.20	0.45	0.00	0.00	0.89*	1.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.89*	1.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

* P<.05; ** P=.001; *** Events are counted in frequency; states are counted in seconds

Figure1
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)



Figure2
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure3
Click here to download high resolution image




Figure 5
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure4
Click here to download high resolution image

